

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Please add the new Figure 3. Being submitted herewith is a new set of drawings, including the new Figure.

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings for not showing the method steps recited in the claims. In the current Amendment, a new Fig. 3 has been added, and the steps therein have been connected to certain passages in the Specification as filed. These changes are believed to overcome the objection.

The Examiner has rejected all of the pending claims, under various sections, in view of Wield. In the above Amendment, independent claims 1 and 17 have been amended to be unobvious in view of Wield. Admittedly, the amended independent claims incorporate aspects found in claims 5 and 9 as originally filed, and therefore the following remarks will respond to the 35 USC 103 rejection of those claims.

Both the Specification and the Wield reference relate to printing a test sheet with a particular type of "rule" pattern, and using the test sheet to measure and correct certain types of error. However, the Specification describes, and the amended claims recite, testing techniques that are neither disclosed nor suggested by Wield.

The Specification as filed describes two distinct types of printing errors that are addressed with the claimed methods. At the paragraph starting at page 6, line 24, there is described an "asymmetry" type of error in reading the test copy: if the measurements of **two** test zones or rules A and C are of a certain "asymmetrical" relationship, there is evidence of a kind of placement error (see, especially, the sentences beginning on page 6, line 29). Also, the Specification describes, at the paragraph starting at page 7, line 19, how the readings of **two** test zones or rules can be used to detect, and thereby correct, a "magnification" error. In either case, these specific types of errors are determinable by reading the rules associated with **two, opposite** edges of the test copy. Independent claims 1 and 9 now recite that rules associated with **two, opposite** edges of the test copy are inspected.

The primary reference, Wield, teaches using a test pattern to make determinations about feeding errors in a fax machine, but Wield mentions **only** that the test pattern is associated with the *leading* edge of the calibration chart (see, e.g., col. 3, lines 40-42 and 60-61; step 4 of Fig. 4; step 6 of Fig. 9). Also note that *every* sample test pattern in Figs. 5-8 is interested only in the *top* or *lead* edge 501, 601, 701, 801 of each sheet. There is no disclosure in Wield of any test pattern associated with an opposite, *trailing* edge of a sheet; nor is there any suggestion of why using **two, oppositely-placed** test patterns, as recited in the claims, would be desirable.

Because the use of rules or test patterns associated with **two, opposite** edges of a sheet enables testing of image errors beyond that contemplated by Wield, the claimed invention is patentable over Wield.

Claim 15 is rejected over Wield in view of Clifton. Whatever the specific teaching of Clifton, Claim 15 is allowable as being dependent from claim 9 as amended.

The claims are therefore in condition for allowance.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment; however, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he is hereby requested to call the undersigned attorney at (585) 423-3811, Rochester, NY.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert Hutter", written in dark ink.

Robert Hutter
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 32,418
Telephone (585) 423-3811

January 5, 2006
RH/fsl
Xerox Corporation
Xerox Square 20A
Rochester, New York 14644